



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/100,799	06/19/1998	HIROAKI KUBO	05058/71301	8949

24367 7590 06/05/2002

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP  
717 NORTH HARWOOD  
SUITE 3400  
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

VILLECCO, JOHN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2612

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/100,799

Applicant(s)

KUBO, HIROAKI

Examiner

John M. Villecco

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-21 and 25-32 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-15, 22-24 and 33-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 35 and 39 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 June 1998 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 7.

### *Specification*

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

### *Claim Objections*

3. Claims 35 and 39 are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - Claim 35 recites the phrase "interpolating process that executed" in line 2. This phrasing is unclear. For examination purposes it will be assumed that the applicant meant to use the phrase – interpolating process that is executed –.
  - Claim 39 recites the limitation "executing a varied interpolation process depending on whether the captured image is to be displaced or recorded". From

Art Unit: 2612

the specification it appears that applicant meant to use the word – displayed – instead of the word “displayed”.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claims 22-24 recite the limitation "the compression rate". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 33-34 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Christopher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,351,087).

As for claim 33, Christopher discloses a two-stage interpolation system that is capable of varying the interpolation process based upon the required compression. More specifically, Christopher shows that a user can manipulate values of K based upon the compression required.

Art Unit: 2612

This K value is input into the compensated variable interpolator (394) and the interpolation process is changed. Christopher also states that depending upon the speed up required for compression the values of K and C can be changed accordingly. Additionally, the data used in the interpolation process is based on color data since the system uses luminance and chrominance values. Furthermore, since the information being processed uses luminance and chrominance values it follows that the system has a filter array of a plurality of colors. See the last sentence of the abstract and Figures 17 and 18.

As for claim 34, the reason that Christopher uses the varied interpolation process is because he is changing the size of the images being reproduced on the screen. See Figures 1a-1i.

With regard to claim 36, Christopher states that depending upon the speed up required (for compression) the value for the interpolator can be changed. This implicitly means that depending upon the amount of compression required, the interpolation is sped up to match the compression rate. Furthermore, as the compression rate becomes higher, less and less data is produced and the higher the processing speed becomes. Therefore, it is inherent that a higher processing speed would result from a higher compression rate.

Regarding claim 37, Christopher discloses a two-stage interpolation system that is capable of varying the interpolation process based upon the required compression. More specifically, Christopher shows that a user can select a value of K based upon the compression required. This K value is input into the compensated variable interpolator (394) and the interpolation process is changed. Christopher also states that depending upon the speed up required for compression the values of K and C can be changed accordingly. Additionally, the

Art Unit: 2612

data used in the interpolation process is based on color data. See the last sentence of the abstract and Figures 17 and 18.

As for claim 38, as mentioned above, Christopher states that depending upon the speed up required (for compression) the value for the interpolator can be changed. This implicitly means that depending upon the amount of compression required, the interpolation is sped up to match the compression rate. Furthermore, as the compression rate becomes higher, less and less data is produced and the higher the processing speed becomes. Therefore, it is inherent that a higher processing speed would result from a higher compression rate.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,351,087) in view of Go (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,414).

As mentioned above in the discussion of claim 33, Christopher discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Christopher fails to disclose the use of an averaging filter, median filter and a simple interpolation method. Go, on the other hand teaches it is well known in the art to replace a group of pixels with a representative pixel. More specifically, Go discloses that the averaging filter and the median filter are commonly used as disclosed in column 6, lines 45-55. Furthermore, although not specifically stated it would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2612

to use the simple interpolation method which involves replacing a block of pixels with the value of one of the pixels so that the processing time of determining the mean of the median can be eliminated thereby giving a faster overall processing time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to operate the interpolation means of Christopher with any of a mean filter, median filter or a simple filter so that a processing time can be selected that will give the performance required by the user.

11. Claims 10-11, 15, and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nobuoka (U.S. Patent No. 5,534,919) in view of Nakajima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,025,929).

Regarding claim 10, Nobuoka discloses an image pickup apparatus capable of changing between various interpolation methods. The camera includes a CCD (1) that captures an image and circuitry for executing a varied interpolation method that includes 3 different methods for interpolating pixel data. Furthermore, although not explicitly stated, each of the three interpolation methods uses a different amount of input data when performing interpolation. It is inherent that when more data is used in computing the value, the longer the processing time and the higher the quality. However, Nobuoka chooses the interpolation method by determining the difference among adjacent pixel data. Therefore, Nobuoka fails to disclose executing varied interpolation based on whether the image is to be displayed or recorded. See column 4, lines 5-65.

Nakajima, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to vary processing speed based on the type of image required. Nakajima discloses the ability select the type of

Art Unit: 2612

image quality required and adjusts the operation of the system to accommodate the selection. For instance a user can select whether they want a high-quality or high-speed output and processing is adjusted. See column 9, lines 2-47. Additionally, Nakajima discloses adjusting a color matching process based on the selection. Official Notice is taken that it is well known in the art to display images at a lower quality than they are recorded so that processing time for viewing the image on a display is reduced. Even though the system is used in a printer the input data is composed of image data and hence could be used in an image processor too. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select an interpolation process based on the type of image quality required so that processing time can be cut down.

Regarding claim 11, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art that the use of a faster processing speed when displaying an image is beneficial to a user so that the image can be viewed on a screen faster. Therefore, a faster interpolating process would be beneficial. Additionally, a better interpolation process would be required when recording an image so that a higher quality image is obtained.

As for claim 15, Nobuoka discloses that interpolation portion executes interpolation based on each color of the image data.

Regarding claim 39, Nobuoka discloses an image pickup apparatus capable of changing between various interpolation methods. The camera includes a CCD (1) that captures an image and circuitry for executing a varied interpolation method that includes 3 different methods for interpolating pixel data. Furthermore, although not explicitly stated, each of the three interpolation methods uses a different amount of input data when performing interpolation. It is



Art Unit: 2612

inherent that when more data is used in computing the value, the longer the processing time and the higher the quality. However, Nobuoka chooses the interpolation method by determining the difference among adjacent pixel data. Therefore, Nobuoka fails to disclose executing varied interpolation based on whether the image is to be displayed or recorded. See column 4, lines 5-65.

Nakajima, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to vary processing speed based on the type of image required. Nakajima discloses the ability select the type of image quality required and adjusts the operation of the system to accommodate the selection. For instance a user can select whether they want a high-quality or high-speed output and processing is adjusted. See column 9, lines 2-47. Additionally, Nakajima discloses adjusting a color matching process based on the selection. Although, not specifically disclosed it is well known in the art to display images at a lower quality than they are recorded so that processing time for viewing the image on a display is reduced. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select an interpolation process based on the type of image quality required so that processing time can be cut down.

As for claim 40, as mentioned above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art that the use of a faster processing speed when displaying an image is beneficial to a user so that the image can be viewed on a screen faster. Therefore, a faster interpolating process would be beneficial. Additionally, a better interpolation process would be required when recording an image so that a higher quality image is obtained.

Art Unit: 2612

As for claim 41, Official Notice is taken as to the fact that gamma correction is a common correction factor in image processing. Gamma correction allows for a clearer more defined image that matches the characteristics of the display being used.

12. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nobuoka (U.S. Patent No. 5,534,919) in view of Nakajima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,025,929) and further in view of Haruki (U.S. Patent No. 5,990,949).

Regarding claim 12, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 10, both Nobuoka and Nakajima disclose all of the limitation of the parent claim. However, neither of the aforementioned references discloses a gamma correction section for correction a gradation characteristic between recording and displaying. Haruki, on the other hand, discloses that different gamma corrections are carried out for images that are to be displayed on an LCD (36) than image signals that are not. The second gamma correction circuit (24) outputs a different gamma correction for an image to be displayed on an LCD while the first gamma corrected image is sent to the flash memory (28). The ability to apply various gamma corrections to an image depending upon where the image is to be sent allows for a better image on the display device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a gamma correction characteristic depending upon whether the image is to be recorded or displayed.

As for claim 13, Haruki discloses that a different gradation characteristic is given to an image signal that is to be sent to an LCD (36) than to an image signal that is to be sent to the flash memory (28).

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claim 14, Haruki discloses an LCD (36) on the camera for displaying the image.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

13. Claims 16-21 and 25-32 are allowed.

14. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As for claim 16, the prior art does not teach nor reasonably suggest an imaging device that corrects for both a frequency characteristic and a gradation characteristic according to the image recording mode.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-6306 (For either formal or informal communications intended for entry. For informal or draft communications, please label **"PROPOSED"** or **"DRAFT"**)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Villecco whose telephone number is (703) 305-1460. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:00 am to 5:30 pm EST.

Art Unit: 2612

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber, can be reached on (703) 305-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service desk whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

JMV  
6/3/02

  
WENDY R. GARBER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600